|    | Case 2:22-cv-00554-TLN-JDP Docume  | nt 27 Filed 09/15/23 Page 1 of 2    |
|----|--|-------------------------------------|
| 1  |  |                                     |
| 2  |  |                                     |
| 3  |  |                                     |
| 4  |  |                                     |
| 5  |  |                                     |
| 6  |  |                                     |
| 7  |  |                                     |
| 8  | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT   |                                     |
| 9  | FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA   |                                     |
| 10 |  |                                     |
| 11 | JONATHAN COLLIN AUTRY,   | Case No. 2:22-cv-00554-TLN-JDP (PC) |
| 12 | Plaintiff,   |                                     |
| 13 | V.   | ORDER                               |
| 14 | SCOTT JONES, et al.,   |                                     |
| 15 | Defendants.  |                                     |
| 16 |  |                                     |
| 17 | On February 23, 2023, I screened plaintiff's amended complaint and notified him that his           |                                     |
| 18 | claims could not all proceed in the same action. ECF No. 21. I granted him thirty days to file an  |                                     |
| 19 | amended complaint or an advisement indicating his intent to stand by his current one. Plaintiff    |                                     |
| 20 | filed two motions seeking additional time to file an amended complaint, both of which I granted.   |                                     |
| 21 | Plaintiff's amended complaint was due August 11, 2023. ECF No. 26. To date, plaintiff has not      |                                     |
| 22 | filed an amended complaint.  |                                     |
| 23 | To manage its docket effectively, the court requires litigants to meet certain deadlines.          |                                     |
| 24 | The court may impose sanctions, including dismissing a case, for failure to comply with its orders |                                     |
| 25 | or local rules. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b); E.D. Cal. L.R. 110; Hells Canyon Pres. Council v. U.S.  |                                     |
| 26 | Forest Serv., 403 F.3d 683, 689 (9th Cir. 2005); Carey v. King, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440-41 (9th Cir.   |                                     |
| 27 | 1988). Involuntary dismissal is a harsh penalty, but a district court has a duty to administer     |                                     |
| 28 | justice expeditiously and avoid needless burden for the parties. See Pagtalunan v. Galaza, 291     |                                     |
|    |  | 1                                   |

## Case 2:22-cv-00554-TLN-JDP Document 27 Filed 09/15/23 Page 2 of 2

F.3d 639, 642 (9th Cir. 2002); Fed. R. Civ. P. 1.

Plaintiff will be given a chance to explain why the court should not dismiss the case for his failure to file an amended complaint or advisement of his intent to stand by his current complaint. Plaintiff's failure to respond to this order will constitute a failure to comply with a court order and will result in a recommendation that this action be dismissed. Accordingly, plaintiff is ordered to show cause within twenty-one days why this case should not be dismissed for failure to prosecute and failure to comply with court orders. Should plaintiff wish to continue with this lawsuit, he shall file, within twenty-one days, an amended complaint or advisement of his intent to stand by his current complaint.

Dated: September 15, 2023

IT IS SO ORDERED.

JERÉMY D. PETERSON

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE